

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	Si di Si io	BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING ST	AFF
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE
REZONING FILE	NUMBER		
- E	Ī	OBBE COMPLETED BY APPLICAT	ŴT
		TE (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PROTESTED	OPERTYBEING 5	77 CAMBRIAN DRIVE	
ASSESSOR'S PAR	RCELNUMBER(S)		<u> </u>
		112 - 38 - 082	
REASON OF PRO		S	
I protest the pr	oposed rezoning bed	Dause See Attachment A	·
		. .	
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property it	n which I own an und (describe property i	livided interest of at least 51%, and on beha by address and Assessor's Parcel Numbe	d of which this protest is being filed, or)
	- 5	77 CANDRIAN DAINE	
		112-38-082	
-			-
and is now zo	oned <u>R1-8</u>	District. (in Sant	a Clara County)
The undivided	Interest which I own	in the property described in the statement a	above is a:
< I	ee Interest (ownership		
<u></u> ⊔ ⊔	easehold interest wh	ich expires on	
	other: (explain)	<u> </u>	
			
			

: Signature(s) o	F PROTEST/	int(s) 🏻 🕏		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an a which such protest is tiled, such interest being not merely remaining term of len years or longer shall be deemed an an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a perso duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of members of the association.	an easement. A newner for purp on or persons, the negal entity is a l	i lenant under a l poses of this prot e protest petition homeowner's as:	leese whic lest. Wher shall be s sociation, '	h has a the owner of signed by the the protest
PRINTNAME CLAINE C DAVIS		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408 5	159-1604
ADDRESS 577 CAMBRIAN DA.	GAMPA		ALE CA.	ZIPCODE 45008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Plani C. Davi			DATE 9	/23/20/0
PRINTNAME Thomas L. DAVIS		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		7
ADDRESS 577 CAMBRIAN DR.	Campbe	. (ATE JP)	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Thorn I. Re.			DATE 9/	23/2010
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	នា	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	_
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	s	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	-	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	

Use separate sheet if necessary

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) SS. COUNTY OF SonTa C)
On 9-23-10 before me, James V. Ddong. Notary Public, personally appeared Thomas Davis + Flaine Davis who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is large subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he leke they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(les), and acknowledged to me that he leke they executed the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PBNALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct. JAMES V. DELONG COMM. #1764619 OF COMM. #1764619 OF COMM. #1764619 OF COMM. #1764619 SANTA CLARA COUNTY OF COMM. EPPRES JUNE 30, 2011 (Seal)
Notary Public STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss. COUNTY OF)
On
paragraph is true and correct. WITNESS my hand and official seal.
(Seal)
Notary Public

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny — the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. <u>Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA</u>. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-8555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

		. 10	BE COMPLETED	BY PLAN	NING STAFF		
	FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT		DATE	
	QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN			BY	
	REZONING FILE NUM	BER					
		Τ.	DEBE COMPLET	ED BY A	PREICANT PE)		
ļ۳	ADDRESS OF PROPE PROTESTED	ونع المعالمة والمعالمة	Cambrian	Torr	Complett		
*	ASSESSOR'S PARCEU	NUMBER(S) みし		00	`		
	REASON OF PROTES		auss See Attach	ment A			-
			Use separate :	heet (fnece	ssary		<u></u> -
	The property in wh	ich I own an undi	ivided interest of at large	east 51%, ar essor's Par	nd on behalf of whi cel Number)	ich this profest is being liter	d,
							_
H	40	<u>ኔ - </u>	10-00_		· 		_
	and is now zoned	R1-8		District.	(in Santa Clar	a County)	_
	The undivided inte	rest which I own i	in the property desc	ribed in the	statement above is	s a:	
۳	🛣 Feeln	terest (ownership)				
	Lease	shold interest whi	ch expires on				
	☐ Other	:(explain)					_
				_ .,		<u> </u>	_
	l						_

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entitly other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the profest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in fleu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME		DAYTIME	h _ a _ a _ a	0017
Merry Wilkins	CITY	TELEPHONE#	4 <u>08~311-</u> ATE	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS 603 Cambrian Dr	Consob			
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Westly P. Willein			DATE SEPT.	. 25,201D
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ş	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u> </u>	
ADDRESS	СПҮ		STATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	ž	
ADDRESS	СПҮ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate shee	t if necessar	у		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)		
COUNTY OF SGRE CLO	ia.) ss.)		
On Sept 35, 2010 before my satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) acknowledged to me that he/she/they ethat by his/her/their signature(s) on the person(s) acted, executed the instrument	() whose name()) is executed the same: instrument the pe	, who pr s/are subscribed in h is/ her/the ir a	uthorized capacity	basis of ument and (i﴿s), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJUI paragraph is true and correct.	RY under the law	s of the State of	f California that ti	ne foregoing
WITNESS my hand and officia Notary Public	l seal.		(Seal)	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californi Santa Clara County My Comm. Spires Apr 20, 201
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) ss.		•
On before m	e,		ary Public, personate oved to me on the	
satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s acknowledged to me that he/she/they e that by his/her/their signature(s) on the person(s) acted, executed the instrument	executed the same it instrument the pe	s/are subscribed in his/her/their z	to the within instru uthorized capacity	ument and (ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJUI paragraph is true and correct.	RY under the law	s of the State o	f California that th	ne foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official	l seal.			
Notary Public			(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest.</u> The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	- 5 170 B	E COMPLETED BY PLANNIN	G STAFF
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	0475
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE
REZONING FILE	NUMBER		
est.		BETOOMPLETEDIBY APPL	OCANT.
ADDRESS OF P PROTESTED	and the state of t	AND AND AND THE PROPERTY OF TH	Cambell, CA 95008
ASSESSOR'S PA	ARCELNUMBER(S)	12-37-019-00	Carpbell, CA 95008
REASON OF PR	OTEST	See Attachment A	
	-	Use separate sheet if necessary	·
The property is situated at	: (describe property by	ded interest of all least 51%, and on address and Assessor's Parcel N brian Dr. Campb	
	412-3	7-019-00	
and is now :	zoned R1-8	Olstrick. (in	Santa Clara County)
	ed interest which I own in Fee Interest (ownership)	the property described in the state	ment above is a:
_		expires on	
	Other: (explain)		
		. <u>-</u>	

SIGNATURE(S) OF P	ROTESTA	INT(S)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undin which such protest is filed, such interest being not marely an e remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "ow an eligible protest site is a legal entitly other than a person or duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such members of the association.	asement. A ner" for purg persons, th I entity is a l	Alenant under all poses of this pro- e protest petition homeowner's as on, or, in lieu the	lease whitest. When shall be sociation reof, by t	ich has a en the owner of esigned by the o, the protest 51% of the
PRINTNAMED DANIEL SCOTT HERNANDEZ		DAYTIME (TELEPHONE#	408-s	59-6154
ADDRESS 62 (CAMPRIAN DR	COMPO	ST.	ATE	ZIPCODE くらめら
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	\ \ \	-	DATE	1-22-10
PRINTNAME Tanya Hernandez		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408	559-6154
ADDRESS 621 Cambrian Dr.	Camp	kell, si	ATE	ZIPCODE 9584
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	, ,		DATE	-22-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ÇITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRES\$	CITY		ATE	ZIPÇODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sheet	(necessary			

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

208902	TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF
Ī	ILE NUMBER COUNCIL DISTRICT DATE
ŀ	QUAD# ZONING GENERAL PLAN BY BY BY
ŀ	REZONING FILE NUMBER
Ĺ	
-	TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TAYPE)
*	ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING DIES DIE COmptell CA
Ì	ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-39-040-00
ţ	REASONOF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A
Ì	Use separate sheet if necessary
	The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)
*	426 Dollos Dr. Campbell, CA
	412-39-040-00
	and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County)
	The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:
¥	Fee (nterest (ownership)
	Leasehold Interest which expires on
	Other: (explain)

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

DDINITH AND		DAYTIME		
Martin J. Sexton		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	40827	17-1860
PRINTNAME Martin J. Sexton ADDRESS 726 Dollar Dr. Com SIGNATURE (MORANZED)	CITY pb-//		ATE	Z(P CODE タエロッと
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			弾 スク	-2010
PRINTNAME C. Sexton	<u> </u>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		409-3732
ADDRECO	Campbe	11 C	TATE A	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Lity (Sex/on	7		DATE 9-27	-2010
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		·
ADDRESS	CITY	5	TATE	ZIPÇODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	<u>-</u>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	_		DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	ł	· -
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	ŧ	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separa	te sheet if necessary			
			-	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) 69	•	
COUNTY OF <u>Santa</u>	Clarg)	1.	
satisfactory evidence to be acknowledged to me that	e the person(s) whose r he/she/they executed the ture(s) on the instrume	iame(s) is/ are s he same in h is	Notary Public, perso Mho proved to me on the subscribed to the within instantial Maritheir authorized capaci (s), or the entity upon behalf	rument and ty(ies), and
L certify under PRNALT	Y OF PERIURY under	the laws of t	the State of California that	the foregoing
paragraph is true and cor WITNESS my har		NNAtto	MICHELLE ANTOI Commission # 1 Notary Public - C Santa Clara Co My Comm. Expires J (Seal)	NOWICZ 851839 K Billornia N
STATE OF CALIFORNIA	<u> </u>)) s	s	
Onsatisfactory evidence to b			, Notary Public, perso , who proved to me on the subscribed to the within ins	e basis of
acknowledged to me that	he/she/they executed t ature(s) on the instrume	he same in his	s/her/their authorized capaci (s), or the entity upon behal	ity(ies), and
I certify under PENALT paragraph is true and cor		r the laws of	the State of California that	the foregoing
WITNESS my ha	nd and official seal.			
Notary F	·ublic		(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	νто	RESOLUTION PROPERTY		2011/2017	
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT		date
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN			BY
REZONING FILEN	UMBER				
	Ī	SANGEN SELEMON SEED	iderena valaria Entroperazione	ANT	
ADDRESSOFPRO	NAME OF THE PARTY			الساء	(A AMA
PROTESTED ASSESSOR'S PAR	CEL NUMBER(S)	ONIGA	THU CA	VV/PDEXT	,CA 90008_
лоосоо∪наРАН √Алс 2 4	nte Amai.G	1-007 P	gacel Number	<u> </u>	2-24-019-00
REASONOFPRO)	TEST				
I protest the pro	posed rezoning be	cause See Attac	nment A	.	
•	-				
			<u> </u>		
		. <u> </u>			
- 			sheet if necessary		
The property in	'describe property :	divided interest of at by address and Ass	least 51%, and on b	Moni	ich this protest is being lik
The property in is situated et: (describe property : Na Author	divided interest of all by address and Ass	least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nur CA 9000R	, <u>Lo</u> an	eo Between_
The property in is situated et: (describe property : Na Author	divided interest of all by address and Ass	least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nur CA 9000R	, <u>Lo</u> an	eo Between_
The property in is situated et: (describe property : Na Author	divided interest of at by address and Ass	least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nut CA 95556	, <u>Lo</u> an	
The property in is situated et: (describe property. Non Author Streets 29	divided interest of all by address and Ass	least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nut CA 95008. sur own p	Lbusti Cree	ed Botween _
The property in is situated et: (720 Uy CROSS ~3	Mescribe property in August 29 and R1-8	divided Interest of all by address and Asset Asset A	least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nut CA 9500R ur gwod A 019 District. (in S	LOCATION Cree	es Between es Posch. a County)
The property in is situated et: (720 Up CROSS	Mescribe property in August 29 and R1-8	divided interest of all by address and Asset Angle Ang	least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nut CA 9500R ur gwod A 019 District. (in S	LOCATION Cree	es Between es Posch. a County)
The property in is situated at: (720 Uy CAOSS	idescribe property in the control of	divided interest of all by address and Asset Angle Ang	least 51%, and on besessor's Parcel Nur CA 95558 LUC CARCL D District. (in Secretary)	LOCATION Cree	es Between es Posch. a County)
The property in is situated et: (720 Up CROSS -: and is now zo The undivided	idescribe property in Author A	divided interest of all by address and Asset A Baset A A HIJ - 24- in the property descip)	least 51%, and on besessor's Parcel Nur CA 900008 TO 9 District. (in Sorthead in the statem	Location Creation Clarent above is	es Between es Posch. a County)

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of all least 51% in the lot or percel for which such protest is tiled, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

months are the population.		_		
PRINTNAME KONALD J. CAUCH?		DAYTIM TELEPH	E IONE# Ya * ろ	71/7182
ADDRESS 720 Union Ave	CITY EAMPH		STATE CA	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Motarized)			DATE 9/	27/2210
PRINTNAME		DAYTIM TELEP!		,
ADDRESS	СЛҮ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIM TELEPH		
ADDRESS	CITA		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	-	DAYTIM TELEPH		
ADDRESS	CITY		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		_	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIM TELEPH		
ADDRESS	CITY		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	····	DAYTIM TELEPH	IE HONE#	
ADDRESS	СПУ		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Uses	eparate sheet if necessary	/		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) } se.
COUNTY OF SAMTA CLAMA	· .)
satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) acknowledged to me that he/she/they ex) whose name(s) 15/ xecuted the same it instrument the per	, Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of s/are subscribed to the within instrument and in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and erson(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJOR paragraph is true and correct.	RY under the laws	s of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official	l seal.	Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Battes May 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) es.)
		, Notary Public, personally appeare , who proved to me on the basis of
acknowledged to me that he/she/they e	executed the same b e instrument the per	is/are subscribed to the within instrument and in his/her/their authorized capacity(les), and erson(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJUI paragraph is true and correct.	RY under the laws	vs of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and officia	ıl seal.	
Notary Public		(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Websile: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

September 1	70	BE GOMPLETEDLEY PLANNI COUNCIL	NG-51ATI S ₅₅
TLENUMBER		DISTRICT	DATE
JUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	BY
EZONING FILEN	UMBER		
	*	TO/RECOMPLETED:BY-APT	IEICANT -
ADDRESSOF PROPROTESTED	PERTYBEING 5	Control of the Contro	., CAMPBELL, CA. 950
ASSESSOR'S PAR		412-39-001-00	
REASON OF PROT	rEST oposéd rezoning be	scause See Attachment A	<u> </u>
		<u> </u>	
		Use separate sheet if necessa	
The property in	which I own an un	divided interest of at least 51%, and	on behalf of which this protest is being
is situated at: 6	describe property	divided interest of at least 51%, and by address and Assessor's Parcel	on behalf of which this protest is being I Number)
is situated at: (520_0	describe property (AYM BYLLAN)	divided interest of at least 51%, and	on behalf of which this protest is being I Number)
is situated at: (520_0	describe property (AMBILIAN) 1-412-39	divided interest of at least 51%, and by address and Assessor's Parcel Dr2, CAYNH BILL.	on behalf of which this protest is being I Number)
is situated at: (in 1520 to 15	describe property (AM BILLAN) 1-412-39 oned R1-8	divided interest of at least 51%, and by address and Assessor's Parcel D(2, CAYNH BLLL	on behalf of which this protest is being in Santa Clara County)
is situated at: (i 52,0) Payce 1 s and is now zo The undivided	describe property (AM BILLAN) 1-412-39 oned R1-8	divided interest of all least 51%, and by address and Assessor's Parcel D(2, CAMP BELL	on behalf of which this protest is being in Santa Clara County)
is situated at: (in 52,0 cm situated at: (in 5	describe property Arvi 1312 Arvi - 41 2 - 30 aned R1-8 interest which I ownersh	divided interest of all least 51%, and by address and Assessor's Parcel D(2, CAMP BELL	on behalf of which this protest is being in Santa Clara County)
is situated at: (i 52,0 g	describe property AVM 1317-141N 1-4-12-30 aned R1-8 interest which I ownersh easehold interest was	divided interest of all least 51%, and a by address and Assessor's Parcel D(2, CAMP BELL	on behalf of which this protest (s being I Number) CA. 75006 in Santa Clara County) atement above is a:

×

S[GNATURE(S): OF PROTESTANIT(S

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entitly other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal antity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

		D. 14 CT 11 (E		· · ·
PRINTNAME THOMAS J. CANTY		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	4067	193464
ADDRESS 520 CAMBRIAN DIZ.	CAMPBEL	\$1 CA	ATE 	ZIPCODE 4508E
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 052	710
PRINTNAME ANNM. DURNING		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-4	10-4278
ADDRESS 520 CAMISKIAN DIZ.	CAMPS		IATE A.	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 09	27/0
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	÷	
ADDRESS	ÇITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		·	DATE	<u></u>
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u>. </u>	
ADDRESS	СПУ		STATE	ZíPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	<u></u>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	¥	
ADDRESS	CITY		STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use sépára	te sheet if necessar	у		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)		
COUNTY OF SANTO CLAMA	_) 55.		
satisfactory evidence to be the peracknowledged to me that he/she/	rson(s) whose name: they executed the sa on the instrument th	(s) is/are sub me in his/he	, Notary Public, personally appear, who proved to me on the basis of oscribed to the within instrument and or the rathorized capacity(ies), and or the entity upon behalf of which the	
I certify under PENALTY OF P	ERJURY under the	laws of the	State of California that the foregoin	Æ
paragraph is true and correct. WITNESS my hand and of the paragraph is true and correct.			M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County MyComm. Explosition 22, 2012 (Seal)	TANKS NEWS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA	_)) ss.		
satisfactory evidence to be the pe	they executed the se on the instrument th	(s) is/are sub ame in his/he	, Notary Public, personally appear , who proved to me on the basis of bscribed to the within instrument and er/their authorized capacity(ies), and , or the entity upon behalf of which th	l
•		laws of the	e State of California that the foregoin	ng
WITNESS my hand and	official seal.			
			(Seal)	
Notary Public			, ,	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. <u>Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA</u>. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



P/anning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

4.5		MPLETED	BY PLANNING STATE		
FILENUMBER	40 00 process seems are well and repair to the consequence of the cons	ADM/ADM/ADM/ADM/ADM/ADM/ADM/ADM/ADM/ADM/	COUNCIL DISTRICT	The state of the s	West transfer of the second
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE	
REZONING FILE NUMB	3ER	,		Вт	
	A SECONTRACTOR SECURIOR AND ADDRESS AND AD		(EDIBY-APPLICANT RINTOR (VPE)		
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED る。	RTYBEING 79 CAMBRIA	in Di	e CAMPBELL	CA 950	08
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	KILLINGO (O)		-016-00	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
REASONOFPROTEST					
I protest the proposi	ed rezoning because \underline{S}	lee Attach	ment A.		
<u> </u>	U	se separate s	sheet if necessary		
is situated at: (desc	cribe property by addre	ess and Asse	east 51%, and on behalf of whicessor's Parcel Number)	,	g filed,
679 CAI	MBRIAN DR	CAN	1pbell CA 95	, 00 <u>8</u>	
Page.	# 412-37-	-016-0	1pb=11 CA 95		
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa Clara	a County)	
The undivided intere	est which I own in the pro	operty descr	ribed in the statement above is	a:	
∑ FeeInte	erest (ownership)				
Leaseh	nold interest which expire	es on		•	
Olher:	(explain)				
				· 	_
·——					

SIGNATURE(S) C	if Photesta	int(s)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an which such profest is filed, such interest being not merel remaining term of len years or longer shall be deemed a en eligible profest site is a legal entity other than a persoculy authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) members of the association.	ly an easement. A nn "owner" for purp on or persons, the th legal entity is a h	tenant under all poses of this prote e protest petilion homeowner's as	lease which has a stest. When the owner of a shall be signed by the asociation, the protest	,
PRINTNAME 679 CAMBRIAN DON	ald Houck	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408 559 30	
ADDRESS 679 CAMBRUN DY	CAMABell	الح الح	TATE ZIP CODE	8
SIGNATURE (Notarized) For Doruh)	Hoved	<u></u>	DATE 9 - 22 - / 0	
PRINTNAME ANN HOUCK		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 679 CAMBRIAN DR.	CAMPSON	sı C	TATE ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized) House			DATE - 22 - 10	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	şī	TATE ZìPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ĊПY		TATE ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PHINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE .	
Use separate s	sheet if necessary			

STATEOFO	CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY O	F SANTA CLARA)	58.
satisfactory of acknowledge that by his/h	evidence to be the person(s) who ed to me that he/she/the/dexecute	se name(s)-18/6 ed the same in	Notary Public, personally appeare who proved to me on the basis of are subscribed to the within instrument and a his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and son(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
	der PENALTY OF PERJURY un true and correct.	der the laws	of the State of California that the foregoing M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411
WIT	NESS my hand and official seal.	-	Nolary Public - California Santa Ciara County Santa Ciara County MyComm Expires May 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF C	ALIFORNIA)	66.
On	before me,		, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of
acknowledge that by his/he	ed to me that he/she/they execute	ed the same in	are subscribed to the within instrument and his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and son(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
	ler PENALTY OF PERJURY un true and correct,	der the laws o	of the State of California that the foregoing
WITT	NESS my hand and official seal.		
	Notary Public	-	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest — and respectfully urge the City Council to deny — the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>, The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 CaI. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3565 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

		то в	E GOMELETER	BY PLANNING S	TAFP	
F	ILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT		
Ç	UAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE	
F	EZONING FILENUMI	BEA				
		- 70		ED BY APPLICA	NT .	
4	DDRESS OF PROPE	RTYBEING		(INT OR TYPE)	. // 4	
P	ROTESTED	62	<u> 4 Cambi</u>	rian Dri	ue, Compbell, Co	7 7
A	SSESSOR'S PARCEL	.NUMBER(S)	412-41	-009		
۶	REASONOFPROTES		1 12-			
	I protest the propos	sed rezoning beca	use See Attach	ment A	·	
				<u></u>		
				<u> </u>		
_			·	heet if necessary		
<u>_</u>	to the standards follows	andles was a substitute but	ided interest of at le	east 51%, and on bet	all of which this protest is being file	_
 - 	to the standards follows	cribe property by 6 Camb	ided interest of at is address and Asse Orian Di	east 51%, and on bet essor's Parcel Number, C. M.	iar)	_
	to the standards follows	cribe property by 6 Camb	ided interest of at le	east 51%, and on bet essor's Parcel Number, C. M.	nalf of which this protest is being file per) pbc//, (A 957)	_
	to the standards follows	cribe property by 6 Camb	ided interest of at is address and Asse Orian Di	east 51%, and on bet essor's Parcel Number, C. M.	iar)	_
	to the standards follows	cribe property by 6 Camb 1 # 3	ided interest of at le address and Asse DATA DATE	east 51%, and on bet essor's Parcel Number, L, Cam 2009	iar)	_
	is situated at: (design of the situated at: (design) and is now zoned	cribe property by Cambo R1-8	ided interest of at le address and Asse 1/2-4/-0	east 51%, and on bet essor's Parcel Number, L, Cam 2009	ner) Dec , C A 9570	_
	is situated at: (design of the second of the	cribe property by Cambo R1-8	ided interest of at le address and Asse 1/2-4/-0	east 51%, and on bet essor's Parcel Number 2009 District. (in Sar	ner) Dec , C A 9570	_
	and is now zoned The undivided inter	cribe property by Camb R1-8 rest which I own in	ided interest of at le address and Asse 1/2-4/-0	east 51%, and on bet essor's Parcel Number 2, L, Carn 209 District. (in Sar	ner) Dec , C A 9570	_

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filled, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persone, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

				
ADDRESS DOSS		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-8	391-3583
ADDRESS 626 CambrianDr.	CAMPBell	C A ST	TATE (95008
SIGNATURE (Noterized)		•	DATES	25/10
PRINTNAME DANA DOSS		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
Log 6 Camprian Dr. C	Ampbell	ca s	TATE C	ZIPCODE 15008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 9/	25/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		_
ADDRESS	СПҮ	ទា	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	_	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	Sī	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)	·		DATE	
Use separ	ate sheet if necessary			
		<u></u>		

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>, The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy. (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjosece.gov/ptanning

	10	BE COMPLETE	DEPARTMENT STREET	AFF.
ILENUMBER			COUNCIL	
OCTATION .	ZONING	GENERAL	DISTRICT	DATÉ
QUAD#	ZONING	PLAN		BY
REZONING FILEN	JUMBER			
Security Constitution				
	T .		THEO BY APPLICAN (Allow OF COVER)	H.
ADDRESS OF PRO	DPERTYBEING	3 (SV)	. <	Λ
PROTESTED		100	ONION	· Due
ASSESSOR'S PAR ルペ	ICELNUMBER(S)	1016	,412240) 15
REASONOFPRO	TEST		· ·	
I protest the on	oposéd rezoning be	cause See Attac	hment A	<u> </u>
I biblest me bi	оровес гогонинд са			
-	<u> </u>			
		Llea conaret	a phoetif necessary	
			sheet if necessary	li of which this protest is being file
The property in	n which I own an und (describe groperty	divided interest of a	least 51%, and on beha	If of which this protest is being file
The property in la situated et: (describe property	divided interest of a by address and As		It of which this protest is being file $-cbeb$
The property in la situated et:	describe property	divided interest of a by address and As	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Numbe	mpbell_
The property in la situated et:	describe property	divided interest of a by address and As	least 51%, and on beha	mpbell_
ls situated et: 1	2 - 240	divided interest of all by address and As	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Number	10-016
The property in la situated et: 1	2 - 240	divided interest of all by address and As	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Numbe	10-016
ls situated at: 1	oned R1-8	divided interest of all by address and As	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Number	a Clara County)
and is now zo	oned R1-8	fivided interest of a by address and As (O) (o	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Number \(\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{2}{2} \) District, (in Sant	a Clara County)
and is now zo	oned R1-8 Interest which I ownership	fivided interest of a by address and As (2) (2) in the property des	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Number L	a Clara County)
and Is now 20	oned R1-8 Interest which I own easehold interest wi	in the property des	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Number Land Land Land District, (in Sant scribed in the statement of	a Clara County)
and Is now 20	oned R1-8 Interest which I own easehold interest wi	in the property des	least 51%, and on beha sessor's Parcel Number L	a Clara County)

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME TOUGH	•••	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408	210-363.
ADDRESS 80 Union Do	GITY CP\$>~	Joles 5	ATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE(Noterized)			DATE	27-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		, , ,
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	s	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	- ;	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	Ś	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	s	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DÄYTIME TELEPHONE#	÷	
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separale she	et if necessar	у		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY OF <u>Santa</u>	<u>Clara</u>) ss.)	
satistactory evidence-to be acknowledged to me that that by his/her/their signs person(e) acted, executed	e the personys) whose in he/she/they executed if ature(s) on the instrument, the instrument.	Notary Public, personally a who proved to me on the basiname(S) is/are subscribed to the within instrumenthe same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies) and the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of where the laws of the State of California that the form), and nich the
paragraph is true and con		die jans of the same of the same in the sa	0. 0
,	nd and official seal. Le <u>Autorio</u> rublic	MICHELLE ANTONOWICZ Commission # 1851839 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Jun 1, 20 (Seal)	n 9 🛱
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.	
COUNTY OF		,	
•	-		
On	before me,	, Notary Public, personally , who proved to me on the basi	appeared is of
acknowledged to me that	: he/she/they executed t ature(s) on the instrume	name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrume the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(les ent the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of wi	nt and), and
I certify under PBNALT paragraph is true and co		r the laws of the State of California that the fo	oregoing
WITNESS my ha	nd and official seal.		
		(Seal)	
Notary F	Tublic.	. ,	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Payes the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest.</u> The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).